



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,816	11/01/2001	Thomas Joshua Shafron	85804-014301	1236

32361 7590 08/10/2005

GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP  
MET LIFE BUILDING  
200 PARK AVENUE  
NEW YORK, NY 10166

EXAMINER

DETWILER, BRIAN J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2173

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/015,816

Applicant(s)

SHAFRON ET AL.

Examiner

Brian J. Detwiler

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 May 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 25-58 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 10 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/20/04 + 4/1/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

Applicant's election with traverse of Group I in the reply filed on 20 May 2005 is acknowledged. The traversal, however, is devoid of any specific arguments. The restriction requirement has been reviewed by the examiner, but the requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 10 is objected to because the word "web" is misspelled as "we" in line 4. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 10 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Applicant claims computer code for "determining the type of web page by HTML and http request headers provided in the intercepted we[b] page." To the examiner's knowledge, web pages do not comprise http request headers. Http request headers are transmitted from a browser to a server from which web pages

Art Unit: 2173

are to be downloaded. The server then returns *http response* headers back to the browser. At no point does the retrieved web page include *http request* headers. If it was applicant's intention to claim the *http response* headers that are returned from the server, then appropriate correction must be made to the claims and the specification. Any other corrections must be supported by the original specification.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0077978 A1 (O'Leary et al).

Referring to claims 1 and 18, O'Leary discloses in paragraphs 18-33 a method and system for facilitating on-line shopping at a supported merchant web site, the shopper having a computer with an Internet browser installed thereon. O'Leary further discloses in paragraphs 138 and 139 the step of communicating code to add a shopping assistant button to a toolbar of the Internet browser. O'Leary next discloses in paragraph 52 that a wallet is created for the shopper in a database on a server. In paragraph 80, O'Leary explains that the wallet is secured by a first security key (password) previously received from the shopper. O'Leary further explains in this section that each time the user attempts to access the wallet, he or she must enter

Art Unit: 2173

a user ID and password (second security key) to properly authenticate the user. Upon authentication, O'Leary discloses in paragraphs 80 and 81 that the wallet is communicated to the user's computer.

Referring to claim 3, O'Leary discloses in paragraph 55 that the shopping assistant comprises a pull-down menu.

Referring to claim 4, O'Leary discloses in paragraph 139 that a web page is communicated to the Internet browser, the shopper enters shopper data on the web page, and the shopper data is stored as a wallet in the database on the server.

Referring to claim 19, O'Leary discloses in paragraph 54 that the user's log-in to the server is secure and encrypted to protect the confidentiality of financial information.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 5-11, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0077978 A1 (O'Leary et al) as applied to claims 1 and 18 above and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0062374 A1 (Sidles).

Referring to claims 2 and 20, O'Leary discloses in paragraph 53 that the wallet "performs all of the conventional (e.g., form filling) functions of a traditional wallet". O'Leary further

Art Unit: 2173

explains in paragraphs 55 and 56 that the wallet stores “Form filling information such as credit card numbers, debit card numbers, shipping addresses, alternate shipping addresses, frequent flyer accounts, membership discounts (e.g., AAA, AARP), loyalty programs and e-mail addresses”, and using this information the wallet “automatically fills in electronic merchant purchase forms with the user’s shipping address, e-mail address, discount numbers, etc.”.

O’Leary, though, fails to specifically disclose utilizing a supported merchant rules and mapping file. Sidles, however, discloses in paragraphs 55-58 a method and system for automatically filling out a check-out web page of a supported merchant and further discloses in paragraphs 61-64 a supported merchant rules and mapping file that is used to perform said filling out. Sidles explains in paragraph 17 that his invention is advantageous because it “enables users to fill in data forms quickly and efficiently”, “eliminates the necessity of manually establishing a directory of merchant forms”, and “can fill forms from both known sites and completely new sites.” Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Sidles’ supported merchant rules and mapping file in combination with the invention of O’Leary for at least the advantages identified by Sidles.

Referring to claim 5, O’Leary fails to disclose monitoring the Internet navigation of the Internet browser by intercepting an Internet address for each Internet site to which the Internet browser is caused to navigate. Sidles, however, discloses in paragraphs 53 and 54 a method for intercepting the address to which an Internet browser is caused to navigate. Sidles does this while providing automatic fill in capabilities. According to paragraph 17, Sidles invention advantageously “preserves the privacy of the individual user by keeping personal information, credit card information, and the like safe and under the control of the user or the user’s trusted

Art Unit: 2173

service provider.” Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to intercept the address to which an Internet browser is caused to navigate as taught by Sidles in combination with the teachings of O’Leary for at least the advantages identified by Sidles.

Referring to claim 6, O’Leary fails to specifically disclose utilizing a supported merchant rules and mapping file. Sidles, however, discloses in paragraphs 55-58 a method and system for automatically filling out a check-out web page of a supported merchant and further discloses in paragraphs 61-64 a supported merchant rules and mapping file that is used to perform said filling out. Sidles explains in paragraph 17 that his invention is advantageous because it “enables users to fill in data forms quickly and efficiently”, “eliminates the necessity of manually establishing a directory of merchant forms”, and “can fill forms from both known sites and completely new sites.” Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Sidles’ supported merchant rules and mapping file in combination with the invention of O’Leary for at least the advantages identified by Sidles.

Referring to claim 7, O’Leary fails to specifically disclose utilizing a supported merchant rules and mapping file and determining if a merchant web site is a supported merchant web site. Sidles, however, discloses in paragraphs 55-58 a method and system for automatically filling out a check-out web page of a supported merchant and further discloses in paragraphs 61-64 a supported merchant rules and mapping file that is used to perform said filling out. In paragraph 55, Sidles further discloses “verifying the authenticity of the vendor’s web site” or determining if the merchant web site is a supported merchant web site. Sidles explains in paragraph 17 that his invention is advantageous because it “enables users to fill in data forms quickly and efficiently”,

Art Unit: 2173

“eliminates the necessity of manually establishing a directory of merchant forms”, and “can fill forms from both known sites and completely new sites.” Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Sidles’ supported merchant rules and mapping file in combination with the invention of O’Leary for at least the advantages identified by Sidles.

Referring to claim 8, Sidles discloses in paragraph 64 comparing the supported merchant data file with an Internet address for each Internet site to which the Internet browser is caused to navigate.

Referring to claim 9, O’Leary discloses in paragraph 52 that the user can launch the wallet interface by selecting a wallet icon at the merchant’s web site. The wallet icon thus indicates that the merchant is supported.

Referring to claim 10, O’Leary fails to disclose intercepting each web page received by the browser and determining the type of web page by HTML code and http request headers provided in the intercepted web page. As discussed above, to the examiner’s knowledge web pages do not comprise http request headers and the specification has not provided any teachings to the contrary. It is certainly plausible, though, that the type of a web page could be determined by the HTML code provided in the intercepted web page. Sidles discloses in paragraphs 55-58 a method for intercepting a web page and determining its type based on HTML code. This is an inherent step in automatic form filling. Sidles’ system must at the very least determine whether or not the intercepted web page comprises fields for profile data or non-profile data as detailed in paragraph 58. It thus would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to intercept a web page and determine its type based on HTML code as



Art Unit: 2173

taught by Sidles in combination with the teachings of O'Leary because doing so advantageously allows a form filling system to properly identify the appropriate data fields and fill them accordingly.

Referring to claim 11, O'Leary fails to disclose communicating a secure cookie to the computer. Sidles, however, discloses in paragraphs 95-99 a method for communicating secure cookies to a user's computer so that the user need not provide a user name and password each time a form on a secure page is to be automatically filled. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to communicate a secure cookie to the user's computer as taught by Sidles in combination with the teachings of O'Leary so that the user need not provide a user name and password each time a form on a secure page is to be automatically filled as taught by Sidles.

Claims 12-14, 16, 17, 21, 23, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0077978 A1 (O'Leary et al) and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/00623342 A1 (Sidles).

Referring to claims 12 and 21, O'Leary discloses in paragraphs 138 and 139 an Internet browser interface displayable by an Internet browser on a computer display comprising a toolbar and a shopping assistant button in said toolbar and defined by computer code operable with a processor of the computer. O'Leary discloses in paragraph 53 that the wallet (shopping assistant) "performs all of the conventional (e.g., form filling) functions of a traditional wallet". O'Leary further explains in paragraphs 55 and 56 that the wallet stores "Form filling information such as credit card numbers, debit card numbers, shipping addresses, alternate shipping

Art Unit: 2173

addresses, frequent flyer accounts, membership discounts (e.g., AAA, AARP), loyalty programs and e-mail addresses”, and using this information the wallet “automatically fills in electronic merchant purchase forms with the user’s shipping address, e-mail address, discount numbers, etc.”. O’Leary, though, fails to specifically disclose intercepting an Internet address for each Internet site to which the Internet browser is caused to navigate, determining if a web site to which the Internet browser is caused to navigate is a supported merchant web site, and if the web site is a supported merchant web site, performing the automatic filling using a supported merchant rules and mapping file. Sidles, however, discloses in paragraphs 53 and 54 a method for intercepting the address to which an Internet browser is caused to navigate. Sidles does this while providing automatic fill in capabilities. Sidles further discloses in paragraph 64 the step of determining if a web site is a supported merchant web site. Finally, Sidles discloses in paragraphs 55-58 and 61-64 a method and system for automatically filling out a check-out web page of a supported merchant using a supported merchant rules and mapping file. According to paragraph 17, Sidles invention advantageously “preserves the privacy of the individual user by keeping personal information, credit card information, and the like safe and under the control of the user or the user’s trusted service provider.” Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to intercept the address to which an Internet browser is caused to navigate as taught by Sidles in combination with the teachings of O’Leary for at least the advantages identified by Sidles.

Referring to claims 13 and 24, Sidles discloses in paragraph 64 comparing the supported merchant data file with an Internet address for each Internet site to which the Internet browser is caused to navigate.

Referring to claim 14, O'Leary discloses in paragraph 55 that the shopping assistant comprises a pull-down menu.

Referring to claims 16 and 23, O'Leary discloses in paragraph 52 that the user can launch the wallet interface by selecting a wallet icon at the merchant's web site. The wallet icon thus indicates that the merchant is supported.

Referring to claim 17, O'Leary fails to disclose intercepting each web page received by the browser and determining the type of web page by HTML code and http request headers provided in the intercepted web page. As discussed above, to the examiner's knowledge web pages do not comprise http request headers and the specification has not provided any teachings to the contrary. It is certainly plausible, though, that the type of a web page could be determined by the HTML code provided in the intercepted web page. Sidles discloses in paragraphs 55-58 a method for intercepting a web page and determining its type based on HTML code. This is an inherent step in automatic form filling. Sidles' system must at the very least determine whether or not the intercepted web page comprises fields for profile data or non-profile data as detailed in paragraph 58. It thus would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to intercept a web page and determine its type based on HTML code as taught by Sidles in combination with the teachings of O'Leary because doing so advantageously allows a form filling system to properly identify the appropriate data fields and fill them accordingly.

Claims 15 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0077978 A1 (O'Leary et al) and U.S. Patent

Art Unit: 2173

Application Publication No. 2002/00623342 A1 (Sidles) as applied to claims 12 and 21 above, and further in view of "Band Objects" (Microsoft).

Referring to claims 15 and 22, O'Leary discloses adding a shopping assistant to a toolbar in an Internet browser interface as discussed above, but neither O'Leary nor Sidles discloses adding a toolbar to the Internet browser interface. The "Band Objects" reference supplied on sheet 7 of Applicant's IDS filed 20 February 2004 discloses means for adding toolbars to an Internet browser interface. Microsoft explains in this reference that Explorer Bands contain information or supply tools that are helpful to the user while using the browser. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a new toolbar as taught by Microsoft in combination with the shopping assistant teachings of O'Leary and Sidles. Doing so would have been advantageous because it would have guaranteed a place in the browser interface for the shopping assistant if one had not already existed.

### ***Conclusion***


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian J. Detwiler whose telephone number is 571-272-4049. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu 8-5:30 and alternating Fridays 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Cabeca can be reached on 571-272-4048. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2173

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

bjd



JOHN CABECA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100